

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

WO

MDR

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Loretta Ann Greer,
Plaintiff,

vs.

City of Goodyear, et al.,
Defendants.

) No. CV 10-1050-PHX-JAT (LOA)

) **ORDER**

I. Background

On May 13, 2010, Plaintiff Loretta Ann Greer, who is a frequent filer in this Court and is confined in the Arizona State Prison Complex-Perryville in Goodyear, Arizona, filed a *pro se* civil rights Complaint pursuant to, among other things, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and a deficient Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*. In a May 20, 2010 Order, the Court denied the deficient Application to Proceed and gave Plaintiff 30 days to pay the fee or file a complete Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*.

On June 18, 2010, Plaintiff filed a “Motion for Emergenc[y] TRO Injunction.” She also filed a “Notice of Informing,” detailing her attempts to comply with the Court’s May 20th Order and to obtain a certified trust fund account statement from the Arizona Department of Corrections Central Office.

In a June 24, 2010 Order, the Court dismissed the case under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) because, regardless of Plaintiff’s failure to comply with the Court’s May 20th Order, Plaintiff

1 had not paid the filing fee, had three “strikes,” and had not made a credible allegation in her
2 four-count Complaint that she was in imminent danger of serious physical injury and had not
3 demonstrated a nexus between an alleged imminent danger and her claims. Because the
4 Court dismissed the Complaint, the Court denied as moot the “Motion for Emergenc[y] TRO
5 Injunction.” The Clerk of Court entered Judgment on June 24, 2010.

6 On July 6, 2010, Plaintiff filed a “Motion for Recon[s]ideration Attorney and
7 Enlarg[e]ment” (Doc. #11).

8 **II. “Motion for Recon[s]ideration Attorney and Enlargment”**

9 In her Motion, Plaintiff requests “recon[s]ideration of application to [p]roceed in
10 forma pauperis[,] attorney. enlarge time to file its exhibits, declar[a]tion combined.” She
11 claims the court “abused its discr[e]tion and improperly denied indigent statutes Plaintiff[’s]
12 application.” Plaintiff contends that the Court denied her Application to Proceed *In Forma*
13 *Pauperis* because prison workers, who are also defendants, refused to issue the proper inmate
14 banking printout. Plaintiff also claims her “motion for appointment of counsel is appropriate
15 so this court will understand the elements of ‘disable[d]’ plaintiff[’s] immediate danger
16 claim.” She also asserts that she stated a credible claim of immediate danger in her
17 Complaint, that she is still being exposed to unclean drinking water, and that her mental
18 illness “shows exceptional circumstances exist requiring an attorney to correct Count II,
19 [b]ecause the disability prevents Plaintiff from doing so.”

20 “Motions to reconsider are appropriate only in rare circumstances.” Defenders of
21 Wildlife v. Browner, 909 F. Supp. 1342, 1351 (D. Ariz. 1995). “The purpose of a motion
22 for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered
23 evidence.” Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985). Such motions
24 should not be used for the purpose of asking a court “to rethink what the court had already
25 thought through – rightly or wrongly.” Defenders of Wildlife, 909 F. Supp. at 1351
26 (quoting Above the Belt, Inc. v. Mel Bohannan Roofing, Inc., 99 F.R.D. 99, 101 (E.D. Va.
27 1983)).
28

